

State Advisory Committee (SAC) For Children with Disabilities
Advising the NH Department of Education Per RSA 186-C:3-b
Minutes for the meeting of December 5, 2012
NH Department of Education
Room 15
5:00pm - 7:00 pm

In attendance: Mike Pinard, Raymond Dailey, Bonnie Dunham, Renea Sparks, Janet Reed, Joan Holleran, Kerri Lynn Kimner, Kestrel Cole-McCrea, Candace Cole-McCrea, Maureen Tracey, Sue Marcotte-Jenkins, Denise Maher, Linda Hunt, Cheryl Pacquette, Eileen Liponis, Dick Cohen, Sarah Cooley, Jenifer Evans, Michelle Rosado, Patrick Curtin, Donna Curtin.

Guests: Santina Thibedeau, Amy Kramer – (Manchester Special Ed teacher). Trisha Lynn (attending for Dan Tanguay-NHSP)

Agenda Item I: Welcome, Introductions, Approval of Minutes- Bonnie Dunham

- Bonnie Dunham welcomed everyone and asked for introductions
- Candace Cole-McCrea made a motion for the approval of the November minutes. There was one correction from Bonnie on the spelling of a member's name on the secondary transition subcommittee. Kestrel Cole-McCrea seconded the minutes. All in favor, with three abstentions.

Agenda Item II: Public Comment

- There was no public comment.

Agenda Item III: Develop Questions about the Data Driven Enterprises (DDE) Report:

- Bonnie Dunham, Renea Sparks and Raymond Dailey will go to the Data Driven Enterprise forum to ask questions on behalf of SAC.
- The DDE forum has not been scheduled, but will be held by December 20th.
Suggested Questions and Discussion;
- What is the bureau's response to address concerns?
- Is there a timeline?
- Who are the other stakeholders? (Three representatives are attending from each stakeholder group; SERESC, DRC, PIC, SAC, SPED Directors, NH Superintendent Association, NH School Administrators).
- Dick Cohen notes that there will be legislation calling for another re- evaluation in three years.
- How is SAC responding to the DDE report.....what is SAC's function?
- What is the expected outcome of this forum? The report has come out, DDE has presented out on results.
- The Bureau will be looking at the top 12 recommendations. They want to get input from all stakeholders.
- DRC spoke to the state board of education after the report came out. It was hoped for a corrective action plan by the end of summer.
- What is the timeline to implement the plan?
- At the January 2nd SAC meeting a report will be given on the forum.

Agenda Item IV: Subcommittee reports

Unmet needs of children with mental health/emotional disabilities: Maureen Tracey, Candace Cole-McCrea, Janet Reed, Dick Cohen and Sarah Cooley.

Notes from the subcommittee:

Janet reported they are looking at students with mental health issues. They are having a struggle narrowing down issues and where the committee stands on the issues. They are gathering the evidence and how to move forward.

Identifications of students, the approach and type of services, and end results – how are students prepared for life. Dick Cohen feels that PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention Services) covers it all with its tiered approach.

Secondary Transitions subcommittee:

Those present: Renea Sparks, Kestrel Cole McCrea, Patrick Curtin, Jenifer Evans, Joan Holleran, Michele Rosado , Denise Maher, and Donna Curtin.

Notes of the subcommittee:

Key issues for addressing secondary transitions and how they relate to SAC's mission

1. Understanding the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders
2. What can be done if district doesn't create or implement the transition plan
3. What resources are available. Programs, access resources, types of disabilities,
4. Timeline. When do we bring people in and who identifies who they are?
5. What baseline data can we have access to in order to identify the needs?
6. When do timelines for transition really need to begin?
7. Higher Ed preparation for special Ed certification.
8. Do students and parents understand the transition plans?
9. What does transition planning look like given a particular disability and what are the resources?

Failed implementation of IEPs:

MEETING NOTES

Present: Mike Pinard, Amy Kramer – visitor, Raymond Dailey, Eileen Liponis, Kerri-Lynn Kimner, Bonnie Dunham, and Sue Marcotte-Jenkins (note taker)

Ray described another way that IEPs are not implemented – IEPs that include “consultation” when the “consultation” time gets used to observe the student rather than provide a direct service. There are risks in making assumptions and in IEPs that are too vague. Bonnie pointed out that one of the findings in last year's report by Data Driven Enterprise (DDE) was unmeasurable goals (this was the first in a list of findings).

Many IEPs are not transferable from one school district to another as they should be. This can be the result of not following the special ed process; i.e., instead of basing a student's IEP on his individual needs, the IEP is driven by a prediction about what services are available. There seems to be a misguided concern that developing an IEP the way it is supposed to be developed will lead to an IEP that isn't practical for the schools.

SAC might recommend the following:

When a failure to implement one student's IEP has been determined in the monitoring process or as the finding in a complaint process, there should be an investigation to learn whether the problem applied to other students with IEPs in the school district. If the problem is systemic, the corrective action should address the problem for all students impacted by it and prevent it from happening again.

This idea ties to one of the DDE's recommendations: The sampling of IEPs reviewed during the focused monitoring of school districts should be planned to target known or suspected problem areas.

A complaint process determines whether there has been a violation of regulations and laws. This differs from the administrative procedures, including due process, that are available to IEP teams for resolving disputes or disagreements.

Failures to implement an IEP are failures to provide a service in the IEP. This is not the same as the failure to achieve an IEP goal, but they are related. When an IEP goal is not met, questioning why the goal was not met may uncover a failure to implement the IEP.

It would be helpful if families were informed when their child misses an IEP service. Another possible recommendation by SAC: *Develop a FAQ with information for families and educators about how to avoid problems in implementing IEPs* (e.g., share the contents of the advisory letter that Bonnie recently shared with SAC).

Agenda Item V: Correspondence, Announcements, Current Events, Handouts of Reports from Liaisons and Legislative Update:

- Movie: *"Who cares about Kelsey"*: It was suggested to have Dan Habib attend the January 2nd meeting for discussion after everyone has reviewed the movie during the holiday break.

Agenda Item VI: Old business/New business

- There was no discussion

Agenda Item VII: Public comment

- There was no public comment

Agenda Item VIII: Adjournment:

- Michelle Rosado made the motion to adjourn. Dick Cohen seconded the motion.
- Meeting adjourned at: 6:50pm